



ATTENTION

Probate cases on this calendar are currently under review by the probate examiners. Review of some probate cases may not be completed and therefore have not been posted.

If your probate case has not been posted please check back again later.

Thank you for your patience.

(1) Fourteenth and Final Account and Report of Conservator; (2) Petition for Fees, for Termination of Conservatorship Distribution of Assets of Estate and (3) Discharge of Conservator (Prob. C. 1860 & 2620)

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| DOD: 11-10-10 | CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES, Conservator, is Petitioner. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Cont. from 111711, 020212, 040512, 051712 | Account period: 3-1-09 through 11-10-10 | Continued from 11-17-11, 2-2-12, 4-5- 12, 5-17-12. |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | Accounting: \$34,377.72 | Minute Order 5-17-12: Attorney Bruce Beland is appearing via conference call. Matter continued to 6-28-12. |
| ✓ Verified | Beginning POH: \$14,465.02 | As of 6-25-12, nothing further has been filed. The following issues remain: |
| Inventory | Ending POH: \$16,100.50 | |
| PTC | Account period: 11-11-10 through 6-30-11 | |
| Not.Cred. | Accounting: \$18,405.01 | |
| ✓ Notice of Hrg | Beginning POH: \$16,100.50 | 1. Probate Code §§ 2631 and 13100 allow liquidation and distribution of <u>personal property only</u> in the manner requested. Real property, including undivided interests, is subject to Probate Code §13151, which requires the mandatory judicial council Petition to Determine Succession to Real Property Form DE-310, inventory and appraisal as of the date of death, and noticed hearing. |
| ✓ Aff.Mail W | Ending POH: \$12,537.04 | |
| Aff.Pub. | (POH consists of cash in the amount of \$554.93 plus an undivided 1/3 interest of a 3/4 interest in real property, a stove, and an air conditioner) | 2. Petitioner also requests to distribute this asset when there is a Medi-Cal lien on the estate. Need authority. |
| Sp.Ntc. | Conservator: \$125.00 | |
| Pers.Serv. | Attorney: \$40.00 | 3. Need Order. |
| Conf. Screen | Petitioner states there is a Medi-Cal claim in the amount of \$108,627.87 and requests that the court authorize payment of the remaining balance of the conservatorship estate on this claim. | |
| Letters | | |
| Duties/Supp | | |
| Objections | | |
| Video Receipt | | |
| ✓ CI Report | | |
| 9202 | | |
| ✓ Order | | |
| Aff. Posting | Petitioner prays for an Order: | Reviewed by: skc |
| Status Rpt X | 1. Approving, allowing and settling the final account; | Reviewed on: 6-25-12 |
| UCCJEA | 2. Terminating the proceedings herein; | Updates: |
| Citation | 3. Authorizing payment of the conservator's and attorney's fees; | Recommendation: |
| FTB Notice | 4. Authorizing payment of the remaining balance to the Dept. of Health Services as payment in full on the Medi-Cal claim; | File 1 - Tortorella |
| | 5. Authorizing transfer of the house, stove and air conditioner to the Conservatee's sister; and | |
| | 6. Discharge of Conservator. | |

(1) Second and Final Report of Administrator and Petition for Its Settlement and (2) For Allowance of Commissions and Fees and (3) for Final Distribution upon Waiver of Accounting

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| DOD: 5-4-09 | | <p>CHRISTOPHER LEE FULLBRIGHT, brother and Administrator with full IAEA without bond, is Petitioner.</p> <p>Accounting is waived.</p> <p>I&A: \$548,165.47 POH: \$610,620.80 (cash)</p> <p>Administrator (Statutory): \$3,490.82 (Statutory fees are \$13,963.30. Petitioner previously received \$10,472.48 after approval of the first account and now requests the balance of \$3,490.82.)</p> <p>Attorney (Statutory): \$3,490.82 (Statutory fees are \$13,963.30. The Mayfield Law Group previously received \$10,472.48 after approval of the first account. Attorney Wall subsequently represented the Petitioner and now requests the balance of \$3,490.82.)</p> <p>Distribution pursuant to intestate succession and disclaimer filed 12-15-10 is to:</p> <p>Christine Adams, as Trustee of the Mickey Fulbright Grantor Trust: Entire estate</p> | <p>NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS:</p> <p>Note: Decedent's mother is under conservatorship in Case #04CEPR00703. An Inter Vivos Trust was established via substituted judgment on 2-22-12, to hold her mobile home, subject to either bond or blocked account, <u>and the transfer of any additional property to the trust shall be subject to Court approval.</u></p> <p>A Petition filed in the new Trust file 12CEPR00361 requests authority to add distribution from this estate to the trust. See Page 8.</p> <p>1. Need Court authorization within the trust case to distribute as requested. SEE PAGE 8.</p> | |
| Cont. from 043012, 061412 | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Verified | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Inventory | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PTC | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not.Cred. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Notice of Hrg | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Mail | | | W |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Pub. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Pers.Serv. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Conf. Screen | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Letters | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Duties/Supp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Objections | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Video Receipt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CI Report | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9202 | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Order | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff. Posting | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Status Rpt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | UCCJEA | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Citation | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | FTB Notice | | | |
| | | <p>Reviewed by: skc</p> <p>Reviewed on: 6-25-12</p> <p>Updates:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>File 2 - Scharton</p> | | |

(1) First and Final Account and Report of Status of Administration and Petition for Settlement Thereof; (2) Petition for Final Distribution; (3) for Confirmation of Property Belonging to Surviving Spouse; (4) for Approval of Sale of Real Property; and for (5) Reimbursement of Costs Advanced (Probate Code 100, 101, 10800, 10810, 10831, 10954 and 11640; Family Code 297.5)

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Age: | | | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: | |
| DOD: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Cont. from | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Verified | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Inventory | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | PTC | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Not.Cred. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Notice of Hrg | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Mail | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Pub. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Pers.Serv. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Conf. Screen | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Letters | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Duties/Supp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Objections | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Video Receipt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CI Report | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9202 Order | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff. Posting | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Status Rpt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | UCCJEA | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Citation | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | FTB Notice | | | |
| | | | CONTINUED TO 7-12-12 per Attorney Chielpegian's request. | |
| | | | Reviewed by: skc | |
| | | | Reviewed on: 6-25-12 | |
| | | | Updates: | |
| | | | Recommendation: | |
| | | | File 3 - Romagnoli | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| DOD: 2-24-10 | | DAVID D. GRABER , Son and Executor with Full IAEA with bond of \$564,000.00, is Petitioner. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: |
| | | Sale price: \$275,000.00 | <u>Continued from 5-17-12.</u> |
| | | Overbid: \$289,250.00 | <u>Minute Order 5-17-12:</u> |
| Cont. from 051712 | | Reappraisal: \$275,000.00 | Examiner notes are provided to counsel. |
| | Aff.Sub.Wit. | Property: 7033 West Shaw Avenue, Fresno, CA 93723 | Ms. Nelson objects to the sale of the property so the sale is not approved by the Court. |
| ✓ | Verified | Publication: N/A | The Court notes for the record that there are no overbids in open court. |
| | Inventory | Buyer: DAVID D. GRABER | The Court continues the matter to 6/28/12 for the purpose of sorting out the APN issues. |
| | PTC | Broker: None | The Court orders the executor to list the property with an appropriate broker or present by declaration sufficient evidence that there are no realistic means of receiving a sales price in the future in excess of \$275,000.00. |
| | Not.Cred. | Petitioner states the property has been available since Petitioner obtained possession via unlawful detainer. No activity has resulted in this property or the other real estate in the estate. Sale to the personal representative is in the best interest of the estate since it is at appraised value, no broker fees, and no fractional interest to beneficiaries. | The Court advises the parties that it will be expecting to hear at the next hearing why the insurance money was not used for repairs. |
| ✓ | Notice of Hrg | Current bond is sufficient after the sale. | Matter continued to 6-28-12. |
| ✓ | Aff.Mail | Declaration of Art Garcia Re: Commercial Interest in Real Property filed 6-12-12 states: Mr. Garcia has been in the commercial real estate business in Fresno for 24 years and is currently engaged with Allied Real Estate, a licensed commercial real estate broker. Without going inside, a physical inspection of the property located at Grantland and Shaw is situated "a ways out" from current commercial development. He would consider it to be rural-residential at this time. It could possibly be used for a minimarket or gas station, however, it is noted that the current zoning is residential/agricultural. South of the location there is a development of newer homes, but they are on much smaller lots than would be comparable to this property. It is doubtful that the owners to the South would be pleased with such commercial development. | SEE PAGE 2 |
| n/a | Aff.Pub. | | |
| | Sp.Ntc. | | |
| | Pers.Serv. | | |
| | Conf. Screen | | |
| | Letters | | |
| | Duties/Supp | | |
| | Objections | | |
| | Video Receipt | | |
| | CI Report | | |
| | 9202 | | |
| ✓ | Order | | |
| ✓ | Aff. Posting | | |
| | Status Rpt | | |
| | UCCJEA | | |
| | Citation | | |
| | FTB Notice | | |
| | | SEE PAGE 2 | |
| | | | Reviewed by: skc |
| | | | Reviewed on: 5-15-12 |
| | | | Updates: |
| | | | Recommendation: |
| | | | File 4 - Graber |

There are two addresses on the mailbox: 7033 and 7035. Mr. Garcia cannot locate any information of record on the two addresses and assumes it was created at some point with the US Postmaster to coordinate delivery to both units of the duplex on the site.

The APN is listed by tax records as 31-021-512, which consists of a 3196 sq. foot, 5-bedroom 2.75 bath, which would coordinate with both units of the duplex, and is situated on a 4.32 acre lot.

Comparable sales are difficult based on the location, as most residential sales are in the newer development (newer, larger homes, smaller lots). Mr. Garcia concludes that due to these reasons, \$275,000.00 is a fair value for the property. There does not appear to be a high likelihood of commercial interest in the property at present. Additionally, this opinion does not take into consideration any defects such as water damage, roof condition, flooring or painting needs.

1. The original Examiner Notes noted the following discrepancy in the APN:

Need clarification regarding the parcels included in this sale.

The legal description provided is not exactly the same as the legal description provided in the Inventory and Appraisal.

The I&A provides a condensed legal description for APN # **512-021-31 01 and 02** and refers to attached legal description that provides a common street address and APN **311-021-31**.

The legal description attached to this Report of Sale does not contain APN **512-021-31 01, 02**, only **APN 311-021-31**.

*Examiner notes that the attached legal description with APN **311-021-31** is not included in the original I&A, only the Reappraisal.*

The Court may require further documentation from the Probate Referee that all included parcels have been included as appropriate in the I&A and Reappraisal as a requirement for Court confirmation pursuant to Probate Code §10309.

*If APN **512-021-31 01, 02** are to be included, need revised order.*

Examiner now notes that pursuant to Mr. Garcia's declaration, the APN is 31-021-512. This appears to be a variation of the above numbers.

Note: The Court will set a status hearing for filing of the Petition for Final Distribution on 7-19-12.

Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Compelling Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and to Production of Documents and for Sanctions (CCP 2030.300; 2023.030; 2030.300)

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----|--|--|
| | | | ROBERT JONES , nephew/Conservator of the Person and Estate, is Petitioner. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: 1. Need Order. |
| | | | | |
| | | | Petitioner moves the Court for an Order compelling Respondent, Sarah Nardone, to serve further responses to Special Interrogatories No. 50-52 and 54-56 of Set One, and Production of Documents Demand No. 5 of Set One, which were served on Respondent on 03/05/12. Petitioner further moves for an Order that Sarah Nardone pay a monetary sanction in an amount established on or before the hearing on this motion. Petitioner makes this motion pursuant to CCP §§ 2030.300, 2031.310 and §§ 2023.10-2023.040 on the grounds that 1) the questions and production demands are relevant to the subject matter of this action and does not relate to privileged matters, and 2) the answered served are incomplete, non-responsive, evasive and the objections are without merit and/or too general in the particulars. Petitioner states that he brings this motion after having made a reasonable and good faith attempt at informal resolution of the issues presented in this motion. Petitioner states that he is unable to proceed with meaningful discovery, proceeds with Sarah Nardone's depositions and effectively proceed with this action and prepare for trial. Petitioner states that this motion is made on the further grounds that discovery should be required and the refusal or failure to permit discovery was without substantial justification. | |
| Cont. from | | | | |
| | Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| ✓ | Verified | | | |
| | Inventory | | | |
| | PTC | | | |
| | Not.Cred. | | | |
| ✓ | Notice of Hrg | | | |
| ✓ | Aff.Mail | w/ | | |
| | Aff.Pub. | | | |
| | Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| | Pers.Serv. | | | |
| | Conf. Screen | | | |
| | Letters | | | |
| | Duties/Supp | | | |
| | Objections | | | |
| | Video Receipt | | | |
| | CI Report | | | |
| | 9202 | | | |
| | Order | x | | |
| | Aff. Posting | | | |
| | Status Rpt | | | |
| | UCCJEA | | | |
| | Citation | | | |
| | FTB Notice | | | |
| | | | Memorandum Supporting Robert Jones's Motion for Order Compelling Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and Production of Documents and for Sanctions filed in support of Motion to Compel on 05/23/12. | |
| | | | Declaration of Lisa Horton Supporting Robert Jones's Motion for Order Compelling Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and Production of Documents and for Sanctions filed 05/23/12. | |
| | | | Continued on Page 2 | |
| | | | | Reviewed by: JF |
| | | | | Reviewed on: 06/26/12 |
| | | | | Updates: |
| | | | | Recommendation: |
| | | | | File 6 - Lininger |

Separate Statement Listing Special Interrogatories, and Production of Documents to which Further Responses are Required filed in support of Motion to Compel on 05/23/12 states that the interrogatories to which further responses are requested are as follows:

- 1) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 50:** What parcels of real property have you owned in the United States from 1980 to present?
Response: Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 2) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 51:** For each fact set forth in your response to Interrogatory No. 50, Identify every document which supports the fact.
- 3) **Response:** Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 4) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 52:** To whom have you been married in the last 20 years?
- 5) **Response:** Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 6) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 54:** Have you ever received gifts equal to or in excess of \$10,000.00 from anyone other than Lininger within the past 10 years.
- 7) **Response:** Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 8) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 55:** If your response to Interrogatory number 54 is yes, identify every gift you have received equal to or in excess of \$10,000.00 within the past 10 years.
- 9) **Response:** Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 10) **Special Interrogatory (set one) no. 56:** If your response to Interrogatory number 55 is yes, identify every person with knowledge of stated facts.
- 11) **Response:** Objection, this interrogatory is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The production of documents demand to which further responses are requested is as follows:

- 1) **Document demand (set one) no. 5:** All documents relating to bank statements associated with you from January 1, 2009 – present.

Respondent Sarah Nardone's Opposition to Robert Jones's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and Production of Documents and for Sanctions; Respondent Sarah Nardone's Request for Sanctions filed 06/15/12, states that the Petitioner's Motion should be denied because the requests are based on the unsupported speculative assumption that Respondent Sarah Nardone made misrepresentations to Mr. Lininger about her assets and marital status. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Respondent made such representations to Mr. Lininger and further, there is no evidence that Mr. Lininger relied on any representations Nardone may have made when he established the irrevocable trust, the only gift at issue in this action. Respondent states that Petitioner's arguments are based entirely on unauthenticated letters authored by Mr. Lininger. Moreover, Mr. Lininger's out of court statements cannot be introduced into evidence by Petitioner, as they constitute hearsay. The issue in this action is whether Mr. Lininger was unduly influenced into creating the irrevocable trust for Respondent's benefit. The Special Interrogatories are unrelated to this subject matter, are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and seek to invade Respondent's constitutionally protected right to privacy. Further, Petitioner admittedly intends to use this discovery to develop "character" evidence, which is inadmissible under Evidence Code §§ 786 & 787. Respondent further states that the Special Interrogatories ask for information related to each parcel of real property Respondent has owned since she was 6 years old, the identity of anyone she was married to within the last 20 years, and every gift received over \$10,000.00 in the last 10 years. Respondent states that these discovery requests are not tangentially relevant to whether Mr. Lininger was unduly influenced into creating the irrevocable trust. These interrogatories seek information related to Respondent's finances and intimate personal relationships and such information is protected under the California Constitution. (*In re Marriage of Burkle* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 1045 [financial information is protected]; *Ortiz v. L.A. Police Relief Association* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1288 [freedom of association includes intimate relationships].) Likewise, the disputed Request for Production of Documents is also improper in that it seeks "[a]ll documents related to bank statements associated with [Respondent] from January 1, 2009 – present." Respondent states that financial information is protected under the California Constitution. (*In re Marriage of Burkle* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 1045.)

Continued on Page 3

Dept. 303, 9:00 a.m. Thursday, June 28, 2012

Petitioner cannot meet his burden and "demonstrate a compelling need for [the] discovery [that is] so strong as to outweigh the privacy right when these two competing interests are carefully balanced." (*Lantz v. Superior Court* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 1839, 1853-1854 [emphasis added].) Further, compelling disclosure is not the least restrictive means of achieving any state interest present in this case. Petitioner needlessly seeks to delve into Respondent's private life. Petitioner's Motion should be denied in its entirety.

Respondent's Response to Petitioner's Statement Listing Special Interrogatories, and Production of Documents to Which Further Responses are Requested was filed on 06/15/12.

Index of Exhibits in Support of Respondent Sarah Nardone's Opposition to Robert Jones's Motion to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and Production of Documents and for Sanctions was filed on 06/15/12.

Reply of Petitioner Robert Jones to Sarah Nardone's Opposition to Motion to Compel Further Responses to Special Interrogatories and Production of Documents and for Sanctions filed 06/22/12 states:

- A. Respondent attempts to argue that Petitioner's discovery requests are outside the scope of CCP § 2017.010. **"Discovery may relate to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery** or any other party to the action." (CCP § 2017.010, emphasis added). Just as Respondent has the right to the discovery process for obtaining information for her defense, Petitioner has the right to use the discovery process for preparation of trial and to discover evidence supporting his claims. Discovery statutes are certainly not limitless, but not one sided either. Both sides are equally entitled to information for either their defense or claims made in the action.
- B. Respondent argues that the discovery requests seek information not relevant to the subject matter of the litigation because Nardone believes the only matter at issue is the irrevocable trust. The gifts Mr. Lininger made to Respondent before the irrevocable trust was created are put at issue in Petitioner's Petition. "Relevancy to the subject matter of the litigation is a much broader concept than relevancy to the precise issues presented by the pleadings. (*Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 161,172 [84 Cal.Rptr. 718, 465 P2 854].) "The 'subject matter of the action' is the circumstances and facts out of which the action arises..." (*Norton v. Superior Court* (1994, 2nd Dist) 24 Cal.App.4th 1750, 1760; emphasis added).
- C. Nardone's counsel argues that the gifts from Virgil to Nardone before the irrevocable trust was created are not at issue in this action. However, Nardone clearly argues the *exact opposite* in her Request for Foreign Deposition Subpoenas filed in Clark County, Nevada in which she argues that "[s]everal checks that Mr. Lininger gave to Respondent were from account(s) at this bank. Petitioner put these checks at issue in his Petition to Invalidate Irrevocable Trust. Respondent needs to determine the number and amount of these checks." Nardone's counsel also states in his Letter dated 06/06/12 that "[w]hile we do believe that the other gifts to Ms. Nardone are only marginally relevant, the subject Petition puts these gifts at issue." If Nardone is able to use the discovery process to obtain personal financial records of Mr. Lininger, a non-party, because the gifts are put at issue, then certainly Petitioner can discover Nardone's personal information that is related to the at issue gifts as well. Nardone's attempt to argue one side to obtain Mr. Lininger's private information and argue the opposite side to stop the Petitioner from discovering information is disingenuous. Since the gifts are at issue then information regarding the facts and circumstances surrounding the gifts fall within the boundaries of CCP 2017.010 and are relevant.
- D. Respondent's objection to special interrogatories 50 and 51 are not proper. Respondent mistakenly assumes that her real property ownership records come under the definition of "personal financial information" that is protected by the California Constitution. The discovery requests are permissible and not invasions of privacy as the records are a matter of public record. Any person can go to the Recorder of any County and request copies of such information. Because Nardone has lived in several different locations in and outside the U.S., it would be an oppressive cost to Petitioner to search and request copies of such information from every county in all 50 states. Nardone's simple compliance with the discovery request would avoid the exorbitant costs and comply with the purpose and spirit of the discovery statutes. Nardone's continuous protest in providing information that is available to the general public is suspicious and absurd.

Continued on Page 4

- E. Respondent's objection to Special Interrogatory No. 52 is not proper. Nardone mistakenly assumes that her marriage history comes under the definition of "personal financial information" that is protected by the California Constitution. However, the discovery requests are permissible and not invasions of privacy as the records are a matter of public record. Any person can go to the Recorder of any County and request copies of such information. Because Nardone has lived in several different locations in and outside the U.S., it would be an oppressive cost to Petitioner to search and request copies of such information from every county in all 50 states. Nardone's simple compliance with the discovery request would avoid the exorbitant costs and comply with the purpose and spirit of the discovery statutes. Nardone's continuous protest in providing information that is available to the general public is unreasonable. Respondent points out that Mr. Lininger through his various letters and writings wished that Nardone would find a husband. Is this not an indication that he was told by respondent that she was single or is Nardone saying someone else told him? Mr. Lininger also states in one of his letters that Nardone "...had agreed to marry him..." Again, an obvious showing that Nardone represented that she was single. The gifts and facts surrounding the circumstances of Mr. Lininger and Nardone's relationship and any misrepresentations or frauds committed by Nardone to receive such gifts are at issue in this litigation, so Nardone's marital status is indeed relevant and Nardone should be compelled to answer.
- F. Respondent's objection to Special Interrogatories No. 54, 55, and 56 is not proper. The gifts and all facts surrounding the circumstances of Mr. Lininger and Nardone's relationship and any misrepresentations about her financial situation or frauds committed by Nardone to receive such gifts are at issue in this litigation, so Nardone's history of receiving gifts over \$10,000.00 is relevant. Nardone argues that Petitioner is attempting to admit inadmissible character evidence. This is not true. Evidence Code § 1101(b) states "nothing in this section prohibits the admission of evidence that a person committed a crime, civil wrong or other act when relevant to prove some facts (such as motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, identity, knowledge, identity..." Evidence of other misconduct by a person may be admissible to prove any relevant fact other than the person's disposition or propensity to act in a particular manner. (People v. Hovarter (2008) 44 Cal.4th 983, 1002.) This rule applies to both criminal and civil cases. (Hassoldt v. Patrick Media Group, Inc. (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 153, 165.) If Nardone has received large gifts, including cash, jewelry and real property, it will be used to show the opportunity and her intent behind unduly influencing Mr. Lininger. It is not being used to show her propensity or her disposition to unduly influence Mr. Lininger, but rather her intent and plan to influence and the opportunity she took when she met Mr. Lininger on the cruise a few months after his wife died.
- G. Respondent's Objection to Request for Production No. 5 is Not Proper. In her Request for Foreign Deposition Subpoenas filed in Clark County, Nevada in which she argues that "[s]everal checks that Mr. Lininger gave to Respondent were from account(s) at this bank. Petitioner put these checks at issue in his Petition to Invalidate Irrevocable Trust. Respondent needs to determine the number and amount of these checks." Respondent received Mr. Lininger's (a non-party) personal bank records from three bank institutions. The funds from the irrevocable trust came from only one bank. The other two accounts were related to the cash gifts Mr. Lininger gave to Nardone. Yet Nardone wants this court to believe their discovery request for Mr. Lininger's bank information is not protected by the California Constitution as "personal financial information", but Petitioner's exact discovery requests for Nardone's information from 01/01/09 to present is protected? Further, Nardone's counsel states in a letter dated 06/06/12 that Nardone's request for Mr. Lininger's bank records from 01/01/09 to present is valid because it "covers the entire period of Mr. Lininger and Ms. Nardone's friendship. Considering Mr. Jones alleges that Ms. Nardone unduly influenced Mr. Lininger during this period, thereby causing him to create the irrevocable trust, **these records are clearly discoverable and not objectionable**" (Emphasis added). Nardone essentially made Petitioner's argument for them.
- H. Sanctions should be imposed on Respondent Nardone. The fact that Nardone's counsel has been dishonest to Petitioner and this court in and of itself justifies that sanctions should be imposed on Nardone. Discovery serves a purpose, and Nardone is callously avoiding that purpose for her own benefit and to the detriment of the Petitioner by wasting his and the court's time in delaying discovery.

(1) First and Final Account and Report of Donald Freitas and (2) Petition for Final Distribution and for (3) Payment of Statutory Fees of Attorney and Statutory Fees for Executor

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| DOD: 04/03/11 | | DONALD FRIETAS , Executor, is Petitioner. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: |
| | | | |
| | | Account period: 12/15/11 – 04/30/12 | |
| | | | |
| Cont. from | | Accounting - \$117,256.32 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Sub.Wit. | Beginning POH - \$114,179.84 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Verified | Ending POH - \$117,256.32 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Inventory | Executor - \$4,425.40 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PTC | (statutory) | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not.Cred. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Notice of Hrg | Attorney - \$4,425.40 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Aff.Mail | (statutory) | |
| | Aff.Pub. | | |
| | Sp.Ntc. | Costs - \$942.18 (filing | |
| | Pers.Serv. | fees, publication, court call appearance | |
| | Conf. Screen | fee, probate referee, certified letters) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Letters | Distribution, pursuant to decedent's Will, | |
| | Duties/Supp | is to: | |
| | Objections | | |
| | Video Receipt | Donald Freitas, Trustee of the Elsie M. | |
| | CI Report | Lawson Trust, dated March 19, 2002 - | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9202 | \$107,463.34 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Order | | |
| | Aff. Posting | | |
| | Status Rpt | | |
| | UCCJEA | | |
| | Citation | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | FTB Notice | | |
| | | | Reviewed by: JF |
| | | | Reviewed on: 06/26/12 |
| | | | Updates: |
| | | | Recommendation: SUBMITTED |
| | | | File 7 - Lawson |

Petition for Authority to Add Asset to Grantor Trust

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| Age: 67 | | CHRISTINE ADAMS , Trustee of the MICKEY FULBRIGHT GRANTOR TRUST , is Petitioner. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: 1. Pursuant to Order Authorizing Proposed Action (Substituted Judgment) filed 2-28-12 in Conservatorship 04CEPR00703, this inter vivos trust was created to avoid probate upon the death of the Conservatee. The Trust was not created as a federally authorized safe harbor trust (Special Needs Trust) due to the age of the beneficiary, (and does not contain a notice or payback clause pursuant to requirements of such safe harbor trusts). <u>Therefore, at this time, the Court may require notice</u> pursuant to Probate Code §17203(b) and/or as contemplated by Probate Code §§ 3602(d)-(f) and 3611(c) to the State Director of Health Care Services, or authority for such transfer without notice. 2. Petitioner does not list the names and addresses of those entitled to notice in the petition pursuant to Probate Code §17201. 3. Notice of Hearing indicates service to other interested parties on 6-5-12; however, Probate Code §17203 requires 30 days' notice. 4. <u>If granted, the Court will set status hearings as follows:</u> - <u>Friday 8-31-12</u> for receipt of funds in blocked account pursuant to Order 2-28-12 - <u>Friday 8-30-13</u> for filing of the first account 5. Need Order. |
| DOB: 11-7-44 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| ✓ Verified | | | |
| Inventory | | | |
| PTC | | | |
| Not.Cred. | | | |
| ✓ Notice of Hrg | | | |
| ✓ Aff.Mail | W | Petitioner states Trust beneficiary Mickey Fulbright is the sole beneficiary of the Estate of Barbara Scharton 09CEPR00512. A petition for distribution of the Scharton Estate is pending and the personal representative has on hand, after payment of fees and costs, cash in the sum of \$603,693.16 for distribution. The terms of the Grantor Trust and the Court order dated 2-28-12 require prior approval for the transfer of any property into the Mickey Fulbright Grantor Trust. Petitioner desires to transfer the anticipated distribution from the Sharton Estate to the Trust. Petitioner prays for an order authorizing the transfer to the trust of the cash to be distributed to Mickey Fulbright from the Scharton Estate. | |
| Aff.Pub. | | | |
| Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| Pers.Serv. | | | |
| Conf. Screen | | | |
| Letters | | | |
| Duties/Supp | | | |
| Objections | | | |
| Video Receipt | | | |
| CI Report | | | |
| 9202 | | | |
| Order | X | | |
| Aff. Posting | | Reviewed by: skc Reviewed on: 6-26-12 Updates: Recommendation: File 8 - Fulbright | |
| Status Rpt | | | |
| UCCJEA | | | |
| Citation | | | |
| FTB Notice | | | |

**Probate Status Hearing Re: Termination of Proceeding for Deceased Conservatee
(Prob. C. § 1860, et seq)**

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| DOD: 11-6-09 | | DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES is Conservator. Conservatee died on 11/6/09. The Thirteenth Account was approved on 6/16/09 showing a property on hand balance of \$14,193.12, including an interest in real property. The Court set status hearing for termination of proceedings for deceased Conservatee on 10-12-11. The matter was continued to 11-16-11 and 2-8-11; however, the 2-8-11 hearing was taken off calendar. As of 6-25-12, a final account or petition for termination has not been filed. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: <u>Note:</u> This Case is related to Page 1 (Conservatorship of Nicholas Tortella). <u>Note to Judge:</u> Examiner is unable to determine from the file why the matter was taken off calendar in February, but it appears from the related file that both matters were set on this date at a hearing on 4-5-12. <u>As of 6-25-12, nothing further has been filed. The following issue remains:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need petition to terminate proceedings for deceased conservatee or current status report. |
| Cont. from 051712 | | | |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| Verified | | | |
| Inventory | | | |
| PTC | | | |
| Not.Cred. | | | |
| Notice of Hrg | | | |
| Aff.Mail | | | |
| Aff.Pub. | | | |
| Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| Pers.Serv. | | | |
| Conf. Screen | | | |
| Letters | | | |
| Duties/Supp | | | |
| Objections | | | |
| Video Receipt | | | |
| CI Report | | | |
| 9202 | | | |
| Order | | | |
| Aff. Posting | | | |
| Status Rpt | X | | |
| UCCJEA | | | |
| Citation | | | |
| FTB Notice | | | |
| | | | Reviewed by: skc Reviewed on: 6-25-12 Updates: Recommendation: File 9 - Tortorella |

10 Noah Vang, Christian Vang and Jacob Vang (GUARD/P) Case No. 06CEPR00894
Atty Carrasco, Chue Vang (pro per Petitioner/Guardian of Noah/paternal uncle)
Atty Carrasco, Octavio (pro per Petitioner/Guardian of Noah/paternal aunt)
Atty Espinoza, Xiong (pro per paternal aunt, former temporary guardian of Christian & Jacob)
Atty Boyajian, Thomas M. (for maternal grandparents, Terry Moua and Cynthia Moua/Guardian of Christian Vang and Jacob Vang)

Status Hearing

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Noah, 7 DOB: 1/13/2005 | Father: YEE VANG Mother: MICHELLE MOUA | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: |
| Christian, 2 DOB: 11/18/2009 | CHUE VANG CARRASCO and OCTAVIO CARRASCO , paternal aunt and uncle, were appointed guardian of Noah Vang and Letters were issued on 01/30/12. | Note: No order has been submitted or filed as directed on 05/03/12. Letters have not issued to Terry & Cynthia Moua. |
| Jacob, 1 DOB: 12/6/2010 | XIONG ESPINOZA , paternal aunt, was appointed temporary guardian of Christian Vang and Jacob Vang on 02/06/12. | |
| Cont. from | On 03/05/12, CYNTHIA MOUA and TERRY MOUA , maternal grandparents, filed a competing petition for guardianship of Noah Vang, Christian Vang, and Jacob Vang. | |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | At a hearing on 03/26/12, the court set the matter for a court trial on 05/03/12. XIONG ESPINOZA's (paternal aunt) temporary guardianship of Christian Vang and Jacob Vang was extended to 05/03/12. | |
| Verified | Minute Order from 05/03/12 granted guardianship of Christian Vang and Jacob Vang to Terry Moua and Cynthia Moua, maternal grandparents. The Court made the following further orders: 1. No visitation by Yee Vang (father) at the Moua's residence and no unsupervised visits with any child by Michelle Moua (mother). 2. Yee Vang (father) is not to be at any residence when any of the children are present. 3. The Moua's are not to use corporal punishment on Jacob or Christian Vang. 4. Jacob and Christian Vang are not to be in any vehicle unless the driver is properly licensed and insured. Additionally, the children are not to ride in any vehicle without appropriate child restraints. The Court relies on Mr. Boyajian to inform the Moua's of the laws effective 01/01/12. Noah is to be transported to and from visits by someone other than Cynthia Moua. 5. The Court relies on the Carrasco's to be flexible not withstanding these orders. The Court made the following orders regarding visitation: 1. Visitation between the Moua's and Noah shall be on the 1 st , 3 rd and 5 th weekends of every month beginning this Friday at 6:00 pm until Sunday at 6:00 pm. 2. Visitation between Christian, Jacob, the Carrasco's and Ms. Espinoza shall be on the 2 nd and 4 th weekends of every month. 3. Pick-up and delivery of the children shall be the responsibility of the visiting party. Mr. Boyajian, attorney for Terry & Cynthia Moua is directed to prepare the order(s) and set this matter for a status hearing on 6/28/12. | |
| Inventory | | |
| PTC | | |
| Not.Cred. | | |
| Notice of Hrg | | |
| Aff.Mail | | |
| Aff.Pub. | | |
| Sp.Ntc. | | |
| Pers.Serv. | | |
| Conf. Screen | | |
| Letters | | |
| Duties/Supp | | |
| Objections | | |
| Video Receipt | | |
| CI Report | | |
| 9202 | | |
| Order | | |
| Aff. Posting | | |
| Status Rpt | | |
| UCCJEA | | |
| Citation | | |
| FTB Notice | | |

Petition for Appointment of Guardian of the Person (Prob. C. 1510)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|------------|--|-----------|--|-----|--|-----------|--|---------------|---|----------|---|----------|--|---------|--|------------|---|----------------|--|-----------|--|---------------|--|--------------|--|---------------|--|-------------|--|--------------|--|---------|--|--------------|--|------------|--|----------|--|----------|--|------------|--|
| Dallas Marie James Age: 1 DOB: 2-5-11 | | NO TEMPORARY – DENIED 3-7-12 STEPHEN and ELYSE MARIE COOK , Maternal Grandparents, are Petitioners. Father (Dallas): WILLIAM “KIMO” JAMES - Present in Court on 3-7-12 Father (Summer): STEVEN SOTO - Present in Court on 3-7-12 Mother: JAMIE MICHELLE COOK - Present in Court on 3-7-12 - Consent and Waiver of Notice filed 5-4-12 Paternal Grandfather (Dallas): Not listed Paternal Grandmother (Dallas): Not listed Paternal Grandfather (Summer): Joel Soto - Present in Court on 4-26-12 Paternal Grandmother (Summer): Carol Soto - Present in Court on 4-26-12 Petitioners state Mother fled to their home on 12-7-11 with the children after being physically abused by “Kimo” (Dallas’ father). While staying with Petitioners, Mother’s other daughter, Chloe (age 9) visited on weekends, but Mother was preoccupied with fighting on the phone with Kimo. Petitioners state Mother had just started to reconnect with Chloe since Kimo won’t allow her to have a relationship with her. Mother obtained a restraining order against Kimo and custody of Dallas, but has now returned with the children to live with him. Petitioners called CPS and were advised to file for guardianship. Petitioners state the mother is not able to make sound decisions where the safety of Summer and Dallas is concerned while in this relationship with Kimo James. Petitioners fear for their physical and mental well-being. Petitioners attached a copy of the restraining order in Case #12CEFL00456. The UCCJEA indicates that the children have always lived with the mother. Mother filed an Objection on 3-6-12 stating that all allegations are false and she was not served. Court Investigator Samantha Henson filed a report on 4-19-12. DSS Social Worker Cathy Flores filed a report on 4-20-12. | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: <u>Minute Order 3-7-12 (Temporary Hearing):</u> Present: Petitioners, William James (Dallas’ father), Steven Soto (Summer’s father) and Jamie Cook (mother). Jamie Cook provides contact information. The Court denies the Petition. The general hearing remains set for 4-26-12. <u>Minute Order 4-26-12:</u> Also present in the courtroom are William James and Carol Soto. The Court orders that a referral be made to Social Services for further investigation concerning the children’s environment and allegations of physical and/or verbal abuse of the mother as well as threats to the family members by William James. Continued to 6/28/12. <u>Note:</u> Additional documents have been filed since the hearing on 4-26-12 by Stephen James Cook and by Joel and Carol Soto. <u>See Page 2.</u> <u>Note:</u> Court records indicate that the mother’s DVTRO (restraining order) in 12CEFL00456 was terminated at her request at the hearing on 3-12-12. <u>If this matter goes forward, the following issues exist:</u> 1. Need Notice of Hearing. 2. Need proof of personal service of Notice of Hearing with a copy of the Petition at least 15 days prior to the hearing per Probate Code §1511 on: - Jamie Cook (Mother) - William “Kimo” James (Dallas’ father) - Steven Soto (Summer’s father) <i>(Although the parents were all present in Court on 3-7-12, they are still entitled to be served with Notice of Hearing and a copy of the Petition per Probate Code §1511.)</i> 3. Need proof of service of Notice of Hearing with a copy of the Petition at least 15 days prior to the hearing per Probate Code §1511 on: - Dallas’ paternal grandfather and grandmother (names not provided) - Summer’s paternal grandfather and grandmother (Joel and Carol Soto) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cont. from 042612 <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Aff.Sub.Wit.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Verified</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inventory</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PTC</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not.Cred.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Notice of Hrg</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aff.Mail</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aff.Pub.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sp.Ntc.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pers.Serv.</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Conf. Screen</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Letters</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Duties/Supp</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Objections</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Video Receipt</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ CI Report</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Clearances</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ Order</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aff. Posting</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Status Rpt</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓ UCCJEA</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citation</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>FTB Notice</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | Aff.Sub.Wit. | | ✓ Verified | | Inventory | | PTC | | Not.Cred. | | Notice of Hrg | X | Aff.Mail | X | Aff.Pub. | | Sp.Ntc. | | Pers.Serv. | X | ✓ Conf. Screen | | ✓ Letters | | ✓ Duties/Supp | | ✓ Objections | | Video Receipt | | ✓ CI Report | | ✓ Clearances | | ✓ Order | | Aff. Posting | | Status Rpt | | ✓ UCCJEA | | Citation | | FTB Notice | |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Verified | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inventory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PTC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not.Cred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Notice of Hrg | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aff.Mail | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aff.Pub. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sp.Ntc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pers.Serv. | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Conf. Screen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Letters | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Duties/Supp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Objections | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Video Receipt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ CI Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Clearances | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ Order | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aff. Posting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Status Rpt | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ✓ UCCJEA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Citation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FTB Notice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SEE PAGE 2

Minute Order 4-26-12: Also present in the courtroom are William James and Carol Soto. The Court orders that a referral be made to Social Services for further investigation concerning the children's environment and allegations of physical and/or verbal abuse of the mother as well as threats to the family members by William James. Continued to 6/28/12.

Since the last hearing on 4-26-12, the following items have been filed:

- Consent of Jamie M. Cook (Mother) to Petition of Stephen and Elyse Cook dated 5-4-12
- Declaration filed by Stephen Cook with a "Power of Attorney for Minor Child" dated 5-4-12, and letters in support of their petition by family members, including the mother.
- Competing temporary and general petition for guardianship of Summer only by her paternal grandparents, Joel and Carol Soto (See Page 14B).

Petition for Appointment of Temporary Guardian of the Person

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Summer Sunshine Soto Age: 4 DOB: 7-4-07 | | NO TEMPORARY IN PLACE – TEMPORARY DENIED TO STEPHEN AND ELYSE COOK ON 3-7-12 (SEE PAGE 14A) | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: |
| | | GENERAL HEARING 8-13-12 | Note: This competing petition pertains to <u>Summer only</u> (See #1 below). |
| | | | |
| | | JOEL and CAROL SOTO , Paternal Grandparents, are Petitioners. | 1. The petition appears to request guardianship of Summer only; however, Examiner notes that the documents mention “children” (plural) in many spots. Need clarification: Are Petitioners requesting guardianship of both children or Summer only? |
| | | | |
| Aff.Sub.Wit. | | Father: STEVEN SOTO - Present in Court on 3-7-12 - Served by mail on 6-17-12 | 2. Notice of Hearing filed 6-20-12 indicates service on the parents by mail. Probate Code §2250(e) requires personal service on the parents. |
| ✓ | Verified | | |
| | Inventory | Mother: JAMIE MICHELLE COOK - Present in Court on 3-7-12 - Consent and Waiver of Notice filed 5-4-12 - Served by mail on 6-17-12 | |
| | PTC | | |
| | Not.Cred. | Maternal Grandfather: Stephen Cook - Served by mail on 6-17-12 Maternal Grandmother: Elyse Marie Cook - Served by mail on 6-17-12 | |
| ✓ | Notice of Hrg | | |
| ✓ | Aff.Mail w | Siblings: Thomas J. Soto, Steven J. Soto, Jr., Chloe Sanders, and Dallas James | |
| | Aff.Pub. | | |
| | Sp.Ntc. | Petitioners state temporary guardianship is necessary due to ongoing drug and alcohol abuse, mental abuse, unsafe environment, safety of children. | |
| | Pers.Serv. X | | |
| ✓ | Conf. Screen | | |
| ✓ | Letters | | |
| ✓ | Duties/Supp | | |
| | Objections | | |
| | Video Receipt | | |
| | CI Report | | |
| | 9202 | | |
| ✓ | Order | | |
| | Aff. Posting | | |
| | Status Rpt | | |
| ✓ | UCCJEA | | |
| | Citation | | |
| | FTB Notice | | |
| | | | |
| | | Reviewed by: skc | File 14B – James & Soto |
| | | Reviewed on: 6-25-12 | |
| | | Updates: | |
| | | Recommendation: | |

**Petition for Letters of Administration; Authorization to Administer Under IAEA
(Prob. C. 8002, 10450)**

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| DOD:10/11/2010 | KARLA DEAN , daughter is Petitioner and requests appointment as administrator without bond. | | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: <u>Continued to 07/30/2012</u> At the request of the Attorney 1. Need Affidavit of Publication 2. Item 5B of the Petition is incomplete regarding stepchild or foster child. 3. Attachment 3(d) to Petition states every beneficiary requests bond be waived. Need signed waivers of bond from all beneficiaries. Note: If the petition is granted status hearings will be set as follows: • Friday, 11/30/2012 at 9:00a.m. in Dept. 303 for the filing of the inventory and appraisal <u>and</u> • Friday, 08/30/2013 at 9:00a.m. in Dept. 303 for the filing of the first account and final distribution. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.5 if the required documents are filed 10 days prior to the hearings on the matter the status hearing will come off calendar and no appearance will be required. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Cont. from | Full IAEA - ? | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verified | | | |
| Inventory | Decedent died intestate | | |
| PTC | | | |
| Not.Cred. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Hrg | W | Residence: Tollhouse Publication: Needed | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aff.Mail | | | |
| Aff.Pub. | X | | |
| Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| Pers.Serv. | | | |
| Conf. Screen | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Letters | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duties/Supp | | | |
| Objections | | | |
| Video Receipt | Probate Referee: Rick Smith | | |
| CI Report | | | |
| 9202 | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order | | | |
| Aff. Posting | | | |
| Status Rpt | | | |
| UCCJEA | | | |
| Citation | | | |
| FTB Notice | | | |
| | | | Reviewed by: LEG / LV Reviewed on: 06/25/2012 Updates: Recommendation: File 15 - Johnson |

**Petition for Letters of Administration; Authorization to Administer Under IAEA
(Prob. C. 8002, 10450)**

| | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|---|
| DOD:01/03/2012 | TRINIDAD RODRIGUEZ , son is petitioner and requests appointment as Administrator without bond. | | NEEDS/PROBLEMS/COMMENTS: 1. Need Affidavit of Publication 2. Need name and date of death of decedent's spouse per Local Rule 7.1.1D. 3. Attachment 3(d) to the Petition states every beneficiary requests bond be waived. Need signed waivers of bond from all beneficiaries. Note: If the petition is granted status hearings will be set as follows: • Friday, 11/30/2012 at 9:00a.m. in Dept. 303 for the filing of the inventory and appraisal <u>and</u> • Friday, 08/30/2013 at 9:00a.m. in Dept. 303 for the filing of the first account and final distribution. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.5 if the required documents are filed 10 days prior to the hearings on the matter the status hearing will come off calendar and no appearance will be required. |
| Cont. from | Full IAEA-? | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Sub.Wit. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verified | Decedent died intestate | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inventory | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PTC | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not.Cred. | Residence: Clovis | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Hrg | w | Publication: Needed | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aff.Mail | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aff.Pub. | x | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sp.Ntc. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pers.Serv. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conf. Screen | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Letters | Probate Referee: Steven Diebert | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duties/Supp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Objections | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Video Receipt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CI Report | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9202 | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aff. Posting | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Status Rpt | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> UCCJEA | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Citation | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FTB Notice | | | |

Reviewed by: LEG / LV

Reviewed on: 06/25/2012

Updates:

Recommendation:

File 16 – Rodriguez